DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 026 SP 035 365

AUTHOR Byra, Mark
TITLE Supervisory Conferences: Promoting Inquiry and Reflection in Preservice Teachers.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conferences; Education Majors; Higher Education; Learning Strategies; *Lesson Observation Criteria; Physical Education Teachers; Preservice Teacher Education; *Questioning Techniques; Skill Analysis; Student Development; *Student Teacher Evaluation; Student Teachers; *Student Teacher Supervisors; Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS Collaborative Evaluation; Directive Teaching; Preservice Teachers; *Reflective Practice; *Supervisory Conferences

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the effect of two different supervisory conferencing strategies on preservice teachers' reflective practices. Two questions guided the investigation: (1) "what effect does type of supervisory dialogue have on preservice teachers' reflective practices?" and (2) "what effect do different post-lesson tasks have on the content of preservice teachers' reflective responses?" Fourteen physical education teacher education majors, each taught three lessons in a K-6 parochial school. All lessons were audio and video taped for the purpose of post-lesson analysis. Subjects were assigned to one of two groups--a directive supervision (DS) group, or a collaborative supervision (CS) group. Both groups conferenced with the same trained supervisor subsequent to each lesson. In the DS post-lesson conferences, the supervisor targeted the preservice teacher's strengths and weaknesses and offered concrete solutions for the weaknesses. In the CS post-conferences, the supervisor questioned the preservice teachers about their strengths and weaknesses (sample dialogues are included). Findings suggested that a "student-tell teacher-listen" supervisory conferencing approach is more suited to helping preservice teachers reflect on their teaching than a "teacher-tell student-listen" approach. (Contains 52 references.) (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 373 026

Supervisory Conferences: Promoting Inquiry and Reflection in Preservice Teachers

Mark Byra, Ph.D.
School of Physical and Health Education
University of Wyoming
P.O. Box 3196
Laramie, WY 82071
(307)766-5227

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Byra

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April, 1994.

SP035365

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Supervisory Conferences: Promoting Inquiry and
Reflection in Preservice Teachers

Fundamental to the role of a teacher is the capacity to identify and plan quality instructional programs. Teacher planning, teacher instruction, and teacher reflection all seem to be critical elements that need to be addressed when developing a quality instructional program. Over the past two decades, teachers' instructional behaviors have been studied in classroom and gymnasium settings to better understand what makes some teachers more effective than others. More recently, researchers have turned to studying teachers' planning and decision making behaviors to gain a more complete understanding of teacher effectiveness. Concurrent with the growth of research on teacher planning and decision making, attention has been drawn to the study of teachers' reflective practices and the affect reflection has on the overall instructional process. The focus of this paper is on teacher reflection, specifically the affect of different supervisory conferencing strategies on preservice teachers' reflective practices.

Reflection as it relates to teaching has a long history in teacher preparation programs. As early as in the 1930s, Dewey (1933) suggested that reflection should be central to teacher preparation programs for teachers' acts are precipitated by teachers' reflections. In the past decade, the attention that teacher educators have bestowed on reflective teaching has increased significantly. This is reflected by a recent issue of Journal of Teacher Education (1989) in which the topic of all articles was "critical reflection in teacher education" and the publication of several books on reflective practice in teaching and teacher education (Clift, Houston, & Pugach, 1990; Grimmett & Erickson, 1988; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1991).

In general terms, Ross (1990) defines reflection as "a way of thinking about educational matters that involves the ability to make rational choices and to assume responsibility for those choices" (p. 98). This definition evolved from the work of researchers (Kitchener & King, 1981; Schon, 1983) and teacher educators (Goodman, 1984; Ross, 1987; Zeichner & Liston, 1987) who have studied the reflective practices of teachers. According to Ross (1990), elements of the reflective process include:

1. recognizing educational dilemmas;
2. responding to a dilemma by recognizing both the similarities to other situations and the unique qualities of the particular situation;
3. framing and reframing the dilemma;
4. experimenting with the dilemma to discover the implications of various solutions; and
5. examining the intended and unintended consequences of an implemented solution and evaluating it by determining whether the consequences are desirable. (p. 98)

Critical to the act of reflecting, as defined by Ross (1990), is the process of inquiry. An inquiry-oriented approach to teacher preparation emphasizes the need for future teachers to question their practices. Smyth (1984) suggests that "when teachers themselves adopt a reflective attitude toward their teaching . . . they engage in a process of rendering problematic or questionable those aspects of teaching

generally taken for granted" (p. 60). Given the infinite complexity of teachers' work, Tom (1985) has set forth a structure to separate the various dimensions of the process of inquiry. Tom argues that the various dimensions or approaches to inquiry-oriented teacher education differ in three important ways. The first involves the aspects of teaching that are rendered problematic by the teacher educators. These aspects may be reasonably placed along a continuum. At one end of this continuum are those aspects which emphasize the teaching-learning processes, what Tinning (1991) refers to as performance pedagogy. In physical education, Siedentop's (1991) book probably best characterizes the essence of a performance pedagogy. At the other end of the continuum are those aspects of teaching which are related to the social, ethical, and political nature of schooling, an area that Tinning (1991) and Kirk (1986) refer to as critical pedagogy. A critical pedagogy involves a discourse in which ethical, political, and social issues related to schooling are examined, not as unquestionable, but rather as problematic or changing (Giroux, 1981; Kirk, 1986).

The model of inquiry applied is the second dimension which Tom (1985) suggests can be used to distinguish approaches to inquiry-oriented teacher education. Model is defined as "the statement of the key characteristics of a process (inquiry), a process which can be conducted in many different ways" (p. 43). Tom suggests that the models of inquiry can be placed along a continuum that reflects both scope of inquiry (knowledge versus knowledge and action) and rigor (commonsense versus disciplined inquiry). At one end of the continuum are those inquiry models which emphasize commonsense tendencies to acquiring knowledge about teaching. An example of a commonsense model is that of teacher as an action researcher. In action research, a teacher examines his or her own situation to learn more about the teaching-learning process (Biott, 1983). At the other end of the continuum are those models of inquiry which combine the disciplined study of teaching with the actions of effective teaching.

The third distinction that Tom (1985) makes relates to how one perceives educational phenomena. He refers to this as the ontological status of educational phenomena. This dimension is best described in terms of a continuum much like the one proposed for models of inquiry. At one end of the ontological continuum educational phenomena are viewed as natural. Those who view educational phenomena to be natural assume that the application of the conceptual and methodological instruments of social science can in time lead to the ascertation of a set of regularities and in turn be used for formulating rules of teaching practice. At the other end of the continuum educational phenomena are viewed as social constructions. Tom (1985) suggests that educators with this orientation view "educational phenomena not so much as naturally occurring events in need of analysis and understanding but as social constructions in need of thoughtful and wise design efforts" (p. 42). This third dimension is the most difficult of the three to link to specific goals for inquiry-oriented teacher education (Tom, 1985).

Given these differences in teacher educators' conceptualizations of inquiry-oriented teacher education, it is not surprising to find in the literature a variety of strategies proposed to prepare teachers to become more reflective. It appears that there are at least seven major strategies discussed in the

literature. These include (a) action research, (b) ethnography, (c) case methods, (d) writing, (e) curriculum development, and (f) reflective teaching. In action research a teacher examines his or her own situation to learn more about the teaching-learning process (Biott, 1983; Kemmis, 1985). This strategy has been used as an approach to teacher staff development (Elliott, 1980) and as a form of reflective inquiry in teacher education programs to investigate problems related to technical aspects of teaching as well as personal and professional growth in teaching (Cohen & Alroi, 1981; Hanna, 1986; Wood, 1991). Outcome claims on action research range from increasing ones insight into teaching and improving reasoning and problem solving abilities to developing positive attitudes toward research on teaching and teacher education (Noffke & Brennan, 1991; Oja & Smulyan, 1989).

Ethnographic methods have been used both within university-based courses and field experiences to prepare teachers to become more reflective (Zeichner, 1987). Students as readers of ethnographies in education and participants in particular ethnographic practices learn to explore the values of curriculum and teaching, and the interrelationships between these aspects of teaching and the social, ethical, and political contexts in which teaching is embedded. The value of using ethnographic techniques in reflective teacher education is well documented. Benefits include teachers who are more ethically sensitive, politically astute, and personally imaginative (Beyer, 1984), teachers who better understand the politics embedded in most all school activity (Gitlin & Teitlebaum, 1983), and teachers who can document and reflect upon their emerging curricular, pedagogical, and evaluative practices (Britzman, 1989; Teitelbaum & Britzman, 1991; Zeichner & Teitelbaum, 1982).

The use of case methods to enhance reflective thinking is a relatively new strategy that has emerged in the literature (Richert, 1987, 1989a, 1989b, 1991). In examining relationships of selected teacher education strategies and the reflective thoughts that preservice teachers provided as a consequence of taking part in the different teaching strategies, Richert (1987, 1989a, 1989b) found that novice teachers reflected about different things and in different ways when asked to reflect on their teaching. This research provided the impetus for the development of the case technique. The case strategy involves two components, an artifact and a social structure (Richert, 1991). The artifact or the case is typically a description of an actual teaching situation that is based on data gathered in the school setting. The social element is the actual discussion of the artifact. The social structure of the discussion typically moves from studying the case alone to studying it together with peers. Because studying cases is social in nature, Richert (1991) suggests that case methodology captures "the essence of teaching as a collective endeavor and knowledge as socially constructed" (p. 140).

The use of writing is another method that has been employed in teacher education programs to help stimulate teachers' reflective thoughts. Most frequently, writing is done in journal or portfolio form. Yinger and Clark (1981) suggest that journal writing "puts writers in a position to learn at least four important things about themselves: (a) what they know, (b) what they feel, (c) what they do and how they do it, and (d) why they do it" (p. 10). Many teacher educators employ journal writing as a strategy for

fostering teacher reflection (Maas, 1991; Ross, 1989; Sparkes-Langer et al., 1990; Stover, 1986; Surbeck, Han, & Moyer, 1991; Zeichner & Liston, 1987).

Another strategy employed by teacher educators to prepare teachers to become more reflective is identified as the curriculum development approach. In this approach, preservice teachers are provided with opportunities to develop and use curriculum. Individuals who are immersed in this approach learn of critical choice in the curriculum development process as well as the knowledge and skills required for participation in the design or modification of school curricula (Ben Peretz, 1984). In several teacher education programs, the task of prospective teachers who were taught to design curriculum within a specific framework, which included the consideration of educational, social, ethical, and political issues related to schooling, was to plan, teach, and evaluate a curriculum unit as part of a related practicum experience (Alder & Goodman, 1986; Beyer, 1984; Wood, 1991). In other programs the focus has been on the analysis of the curriculum development process in schools to sensitize students to the values and assumptions which are peculiar to different curriculum materials and programs (Ben Peretz, 1984; Zeichner & Liston, 1987).

The final approach gleaned from the literature on teacher education to prepare reflective teachers is labeled the 'Reflective Teaching' procedure (Cruikshank, 1987). This is a highly structured technical procedure involving planning, teaching, testing, and reflection. In small groups of four to six members, one individual is designated the teacher and teaches a 10- to 15-minute 'Reflective Teaching Lesson' deemed content-free to the other group members. Following the lesson, a post-test is administered to examine student learning and an instrument to ascertain learner satisfaction. Then the designated teacher facilitates group discussion on the teaching variables thought to have impacted student learning. Finally, all of the small groups in the class gather together to reflect on teaching and learning. This cycle is then repeated. Although several researchers suggest that Reflective Teaching can enhance the reflective abilities of preservice teachers (Cruikshank, 1987; Gore, 1987), little empirical evidence exists to support these statements. Gore (1987) has proposed two modifications for the improvement of the Reflective Teaching approach: (a) teach lessons which are meaningful to the teacher, not content-free, and (b) expand the discussion after teaching to include things as the student's own assumptions and beliefs and how they affect their teaching.

Although scholars in physical education accept and promote the notion of reflective teaching (Dodds, 1989; Gore, 1987; Graham, 1991; Kirk, 1986; Tinning, 1991), little research has been conducted to support the use and claims of the reflective approaches described in teacher education research. Two studies specific to teacher reflection in the content area of physical education were gleaned from the research. In a case study of preservice teachers' reflections about teaching during a pedagogy course, Gore (1990) found that preservice teachers' reflective thoughts differed regarding what and how they reflected.

In the second study of preservice teachers' reflective thinking in physical education, Tsangaridou and O'Sullivan (in press) developed a framework for analyzing preservice teachers' reflective thoughts and then examined the affect that two reflective pedagogical strategies had on the teachers' reflective thoughts. The participants in this study completed reflective logs and video commentaries of their teaching and observed and analyzed two physical education lessons taught by experienced physical education teachers. The framework for analyzing the preservice teachers reflective thoughts was developed through an inductive analysis of the subjects' reflective logs and video commentaries, and transcribed verbal observations of the experienced physical education teachers.

The same data were also used to examine the affect that reflective pedagogical strategies had on preservice physical education teachers' reflective thoughts. Subjects in this study were randomly assigned to one of two groups, a reflective group or a regular group. The reflective logs and video commentary assignments as they were presented to the two groups differed in terms of the information (questions) provided for the purpose of guiding the subjects through the reflective process. Those subjects who used reflective pedagogical strategies that included specific and challenging questions (reflective group) provided more analytical responses to their teaching than those subjects (regular group) who did not. The reflective group's statements contained descriptive information about a teaching act, rationale for the action, and explanation and evaluation of the action described more frequently than did the regular group's responses.

Information about what preservice teachers view as problematic (the content of their reflections) and the instructional strategies and approaches practiced in teacher preparation programs to enhance reflective thinking is limited in the area of physical education. In many physical education teacher education (PETE) programs, sessions for discussing and stimulating thought on teacher reflection and opportunities to practice the skills necessary for enhancing reflective thinking are absent from the planned curriculum. If teacher educators in physical education are to embrace the notion that teacher reflection is critical to the instructional process, then there is a need for continued research in this area.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the effect of two different supervisory conferencing strategies on preservice teachers' reflective practices. Two questions helped to guide the investigation: (a) What effect does type of supervisory dialogue have on preservice teachers' reflective practices? and (b) What effect do different post-lesson tasks have on the content of preservice teachers' reflective responses?

Methods

Subjects and Setting

Fourteen PETE majors, four females and 10 males, from the same teacher preparation program volunteered to participate in this study. All of the majors (juniors) had completed a common core of professional preparation courses and one formal pre-student teaching experience prior to this study. The study took place in a K-6 parochial school.

Procedures

Each subject taught three 30-minute lessons to randomly assigned classes of nine to 13 learners. Each major taught the same class of learners during the three lessons. All of the lessons were audio-videotaped for the purpose of post-lesson analysis.

The PETE majors were randomly assigned to one of two groups. One group was identified as the directive supervision group (DS; n=7) while the other was identified as the collaborative supervision group (CS; n=7). The majors in both groups conferenced with the same trained supervisor after each of their three lessons. A clinical model of supervision (clinical viewed as a concept as opposed to a format) was used.

In the DS post-lesson conferences, the supervisor targeted the majors' strengths and weaknesses and offered concrete solutions for the weaknesses. First, the majors were given feedback about one or two strengths of their lesson, then information (identification and solutions) about one or two weaknesses, followed by feedback about one or two additional strengths. A teacher-tell student-listen approach dominated the DS conferences. A sample dialogue between supervisor and preservice teacher is presented in Figure 1.

In the CS post-lesson conferences, the supervisor questioned the majors about their strengths and weaknesses. Each conference began with the supervisor stating, "Tell me about the lesson." Once the major entered the conversation, the supervisor asked follow-up questions to allow him/her to elaborate on specific strengths and weaknesses of the lesson and possible solutions to weaknesses. A student-tell teacher-listen/question approach dominated the CS conferences. A sample dialogue between supervisor and preservice teacher is presented in Figure 1.

Place Figure 1 About Here

The supervisory conferences lasted between 5 and 10 minutes. Information about teaching techniques, class management procedures, what was being taught, and why it was being taught was discussed during the supervisory conferences in both conditions. Systematic observation techniques were employed by the supervisor during the observation of all lessons. Information about how the preservice teachers used their class time (ALT-PE; Parker, 1989), presented the lesson subject matter (QDITC; Byra, 1992), or interacted with students as they performed the skills (teacher feedback) was collected systematically.

Following each of their three lessons, the subjects in both groups were instructed to complete the same two reflective tasks. The first task was to describe in detail a significant event that happened during the lesson. The statement, "it (significant event) may be significant because it was something that excited you, bothered you, made you re-think your intentions or beliefs, or made you realize that your intentions/beliefs were sound" (Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, in press) was included on the form. This assignment necessitated the preservice teachers to generate a written response that was based on their

memory of the lesson, not their visual impressions from viewing the videotape. No statement or question which might have prompted specific responses were attached to the form. The PETE majors completed the significant event assignment immediately following the supervisory conferences.

The second task that the subjects were instructed to complete after each lesson was a video-commentary (Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, in press). After viewing each lesson (from videotape), the PETE majors were asked to summarize and criticize the lesson. The majors were told that they may consider the following three questions when summarizing and criticizing their lesson: (a) How do you feel about your teaching performance?; (b) What are the strengths of this lesson?; and (c) What aspects of this lesson do you think you can improve? These three questions were listed the assignment form. The video-commentary exercise was completed the same day that each lesson was taught.

Source of Data

Data from three sources were analyzed in this study. The first and second data sets were from the subjects' post-lesson significant event and video-commentary exercises. The participants' handwritten responses were collected after each post-lesson conference and typed for later analysis. The third data set was generated from the structured interviews which were conducted at the completion of the study. Subjects were asked to respond to four questions about the post-lesson conferences and significant event and video-commentary tasks (see Figure 2). Each interview lasted between 5 and 10 minutes. All of the subject interviews were tape recorded and subsequently transcribed for analysis.

Place Figure 2 About Here

Data Analysis

Data from the significant event and video-commentary assignments were analyzed using Tsangaridou and O'Sullivan's (in press) Reflective Framework for Teaching in Physical Education. This framework was conceptualized from the reflective teaching literature (Ross, 1989; Van Manen, 1977; Zeichner & Liston, 1985) and developed for the purpose of describing the focus and level of preservice physical education teachers' reflections. The framework is "a conceptual vehicle which describes the content of prospective teachers' reflection and the nature of that reflection" (Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, in press). Focus of reflection can be classified as technical, situational, or sensitizing. Technical reflection is concerned with teaching techniques and classroom management procedures, while situational reflection deals with contextual elements of teaching, and sensitizing reflection with the ethical, social, and political issues related to schooling. Level of reflection can be presented by description, justification, or critique. Description reflects descriptive information about some act of teaching, while justification provides a rationale for some teaching act, and critique an explanation and assessment of some act of teaching. Samples of the focus and levels of reflection are presented in Figure 3. The number of pedagogical events derived from the significant event and video-commentary assignments were summed and percentage scores calculated for the three focus of reflection and three level of reflection categories.

Place Figure 3 About Here

The subjects' responses to the post-study interview questions were read and then categorized according to commonalities (inductive analysis). The post-study interview data were used to cross-check the significant event and video-commentary findings and to learn more about the value of the reflective strategies employed in the study as perceived by the preservice teachers.

Interobserver Agreement

A total of 20 significant event and 20 video-commentary responses were selected at random and reanalyzed by a second observer to determine interobserver agreement. The second observer was familiar with the instrument used for categorizing the subjects' written responses. Using simple percentage of agreement, interobserver agreement scores of 80% and 84% were yielded for the focus of reflection and level of reflection categories, respectively.

Results

A total of 36 pedagogical segments were recorded for the directive supervision group (DS) and 54 for the collaborative supervision group (CS). In several cases segments contained more than one event. These cases were analyzed as containing separate segments. Data for two subjects, one from each group, were incomplete as a result of audiovisual problems.

For focus of reflection, the majority of both groups' pedagogical events were classified as technical (see Table 1). This finding is similar to Tsangaridou and O'Sullivan's (in press). Although the number of events categorized as technical was large for both groups, a larger proportion of the DS groups' events were related to technical aspects of teaching than the CS groups' events.

Place Table 1 About Here

When written responses for the two dependent variables were analyzed separately, a substantial difference was revealed between groups for the significant event task (see Table 2). More than 70% of the DS group's responses were categorized as technical compared to approximately 30% of the CS group's responses.

Place Table 2 About Here

In terms of level of reflection, the PETE majors in the DC and CS groups responded in much the same manner. Approximately 30% of the majors' responses in both groups involved description, justification, and critique (see Table 3). These results are similar to the findings for the reflective group in Tsangaridou and O'Sullivan's (in press) study. When written responses for the two dependent variables were separated, the between group findings were similar (see Table 4). The type of supervisory strategy imposed during the conferences did not seem to affect the level of teacher reflection, as reflected by the majors' responses in the two post-lesson tasks.

Place Tables 3 and 4 Here

A word count analysis was also conducted for each pedagogical segment. This quantitative analysis was included to supplement the inductive analysis of the significant event and video-commentary responses. On average, a greater number of words were contained in the written responses of the subjects in the collaborative group ($\bar{x}$ =124.5) than in the directive group ($\bar{x}$ =102.6). This finding was statistically significant, $F(1,71)=4.19, p<.05$.

Discussion

Within the limitations of this study--which include the small number of subjects and the use of only descriptive statistics--it seems that a student-tell teacher-listen/question supervisory conferencing approach is more suited to helping preservice teachers reflect on their teaching than a teacher-tell student-listen approach. Wood (1991) and Richardson-Koehler (1988) concur that this strategy stimulates preservice teachers to reflect on their teaching, however, unlike in this study, data were not collected by either researcher to support this claim. Assuming that more writing means more thinking, the word count data, although only a quantitative measure, might also be construed to support the notion that the collaborative approach was more suited in helping preservice teachers reflect about their teaching than the directive approach.

The results from this study seem to suggest that the questioning strategy used in the collaborative supervisory approach may have influenced the preservice teachers to reflect on more than just teaching techniques and class management procedures, specifically issues related to the "wider educational, social, economic, and political conditions which impinge upon and shape classroom practice" (Zeichner & Teitlebaum, 1982, p. 104). Over the past decade, there has been considerable criticism of teacher preparation programs that simply emphasize technical aspects of teaching. Critics suggest that these programs produce teachers who are unlikely to reflect on what ought to be taught in schools and why it ought to be taught, as well as the social, ethical, and political nature of schooling. Recently, there has been a growing interest in developing teacher preparation programs in which students are encouraged to be inquisitive and make connections between the classroom and the broader educational, social, and political agendas which shape classroom practice (Zeichner & Teitlebaum, 1982). Both Kirk (1986) and Tinning (1991) indicate that future teachers who receive an education based only on technical competence will likely not reflect on the ethical, political, and social issues related to the process of schooling.

It seems logical that the focus of much of the preservice teachers' reflective thoughts in this study would be directed toward technical aspects of teaching, given the context in which the significant event and video-commentary tasks were completed (ie., specifically linked to the preservice teachers' lessons). This has implications for the development and design of curricula in teacher preparation programs. The strategies employed in this study seem to be appropriately designed to encourage students to reflect on the act of teaching. However, for inquiry and reflection to be central to a teacher preparation program,

additional strategies that are specifically designed to enhance preservice teachers to make connections between classroom practice and what ought to be taught in schools and why it ought to be taught need to be included. One such strategy is the curriculum approach. Individuals who are immersed in this approach learn of critical choice in the curriculum development process as well as the knowledge and skills required for participation in the design or modification of school curricula (Ben Peretz, 1984). The significant event and video-commentary reflective tasks which seem to encourage students to reflect on the act of teaching, and the curriculum development approach in which students design curriculum within a framework that revolves around educational, social, ethical, and political issues related to schooling may be an excellent combination of strategies to enhance the development of preservice teachers' reflective thinking.

Summary

Once preservice teachers complete their teacher preparation program and enter the 'real' world of teaching, they are often on their own. Any changes that they make to their teaching and/or have about their thoughts regarding what ought to be taught and why it ought to be taught will probably be the result of self-reflection. If preservice teachers do not experience tasks that necessitate them to reflect on the act of teaching and the world in which they teach, they will likely make few changes as teachers. Employing a strategy that requires the preservice teacher to produce questions and answers about his/her teaching, like the one used in this study with the subjects in the collaborative group, seems to be a step in the direction of helping future teachers be reflective. However, much more is needed. This study represents but one approach to help preservice teachers become reflective practitioners.

Given the limited data base, there is a need for continued research in physical education to further examine the notion that teacher reflection is critical to the instructional and curricular processes of teaching. This study raises as many questions as it seems to answer. Questions that might be addressed in future research include: (a) What long term affect does the student-tell teacher-listen/question approach have on preservice teachers' reflective thinking? (b) What affect will using a combination of reflective approaches have on the content of preservice teachers' reflective thinking? and (c) How can reflective thinking about "wider educational, social, economic, and political conditions which impinge upon and shape classroom practice" (Zeichner & Teitlebaum, 1982, p. 104) best be facilitated? What strategies will facilitate this type of reflective thinking?

References

Alder, S., & Goodman, J. (1986). Critical theory as a foundation for methods courses. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(4), 2-8.

Ben Peretz, M. (1984). Curriculum theory and practice in teacher education. In L. Katz & J. Raths (Eds.), Advances in teacher education (Volume 1). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Beyer, L. (1984). Field experience and ideology and the development of critical reflectivity. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 36-41.

Biott, C. (1983). The foundations of classroom action research in initial teacher training. Journal of Education for Teaching, 9(2), 152-160.

Britzman, D. (1989). Who has the floor? Curriculum, teaching, and the English student teacher's struggle for voice. Curriculum Inquiry, 19(2), 143-162.

Byra, M. (1992). Measuring qualitative aspects of teaching in physical education. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 63(3), 83-89.

Clift, R.T., Houston, W.R., & Pugach, M.C. (Eds.). (1990). Encouraging reflective practice in education. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Cohen, A., & Alroi, N. (1981). Diagnostic action research as an instrument in teacher education. Journal of Education for Teaching, 7(2), 176-186.

Cruikshank, D. (1987). Reflective teaching: The preparation of students of teaching. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process. New York, NY: D.C. Heath and Company.

Dodds, P. (1989). Trainees, field experiences, and socialization into teaching. In T.J. Templin & P.C. Schempp (Eds.), Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach (pp. 81-104). Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark.

Elliott, J. (1980). Implications of classroom research for professional development. In E. Hoyle & J. Meggary (Eds.), Professional development of teachers: World yearbook of education 1980 (pp. 308-324). London: Kogan Page.

Giroux, H. (1981). Ideology, culture, and the process of schooling. London: Falmer.

Gitlin, A., & Teitelbaum, K. (1983). Linking theory and practice: The use of ethnographic methodology by prospective teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 9(3), 225-234.

Goodman, J. (1984). Reflection and teacher education: A case study and theoretical analysis. Interchange, 15(3), 9-26.

Gore, J. (1987). Reflecting on reflective teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(2), 33-39.

Gore, J. (1990). Pedagogy as text in physical education: Beyond the preferred reading. In D. Kirk & R. Tinning (Eds.), Physical education, curriculum, and culture: Critical issues in the contemporary crisis (pp. 101-138). London: Falmer.

Graham, K. (1991). The influence of teacher education on preservice development: Beyond a custodial orientation. Quest, 43(1), 1-19.

Grimmett, P., & Erickson, G. (Eds.). (1988). Reflection in teacher education. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hanna, B. (1986). Improving student teaching effectiveness through action research projects. Action in Teaching Education, 8(3), 51-56.

Kemmis, S. (1985). Action research and the politics of reflection. In D. Boud, R. Keogh, & D. Walker (Eds.), Reflection: Turning experience into learning (pp. 139-163). London: Kogan Page.

Kirk, D. (1986). A critical pedagogy for teacher education: Toward an inquiry-oriented approach. journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 5(4), 230-246.

Kitchener, K., & King, P. (1981). Reflective judgment concepts of justification and their relationship to age and education. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 2, 89-116.

Maas, J. (1991). Writing and reflection in teacher education. In B.R. Tabachnick & K.M. Zeichner (Eds.), Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education (pp. 211-225). London: Falmer.

Noffke, S.E., & Brennan, M. (1991). Student teachers use action research: Issues and examples. In B.R. Tabachnick & K.M. Zeichner (Eds.), Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education (pp. 186-201). London: Falmer.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Oja, S.N., & Smulyan, L. (1989). Collaborative action research: A developmental approach. Basingstoke: Falmer.

Parker, M. (1989). Academic learning time physical education (ALT-PE) 1982 revision. In P. Darst, D. Zakrajsek, & V. Mancini (Eds.), Analyzing physical education and sport instruction (pp. 195-206). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Richardson-Koehler, V. (1988). Barriers to the effective supervision of student teaching: A field study. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 28-34.

Richert, A.E. (1987). Reflex to reflection: Facilitating reflection in novice teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Richert, A.E. (1989a). Cases written by teachers: Case method and inquiry in teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Richert, A.E. (1989b). Preparing cases, promoting reflection: A case for case methods in teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Richert, A.E. (1991). Case methods and teacher education: Using cases to teach teacher reflection. In B.R. Tabachnick & K.M. Zeichner (Eds.), Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education (pp. 130-150). London: Falmer.

Ross, D.D. (1989). First steps in developing a reflective approach. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(2), 31-35.

Ross, D.D. (1990). Programmatic structures for the preparation of reflective teachers. In R.T. Clift, W.R. Houston, & M.C. Pugach (Eds.), Encouraging reflective practice in education: An analysis of issues and programs (pp. 97-118). New York, NY: Teachers College.

Schon, D.A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Siedentop, D. (1991). Developing teaching skills in physical education (3rd ed.). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Smyth, W.J. (1984). Teachers as collaborators in clinical supervision: Cooperative learning about teaching. Teacher Education, 24, 60-68.

Sparkes-Langer, G.M., Simmons, J.M., Pasch, M., Colton, A., & Starko, A. (1990). Reflective pedagogical thinking: How can we promote it and measure it? Journal of Teacher Education, 41(5), 23-32.

Stover, L. (1986). Writing to learn in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(4), 20-23.

Surbeck, E., Han, E., & Moyer, J. (1991). Assessing reflective responses in journals. Educational Leadership, 48(6), 25-27.

Tabachnick, B.R., & Zeichner, K.M. (Eds.). (1991). Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education. London: Falmer.

Teitelbaum, K., & Britzman, D.P. (1991). Reading and doing ethnography: Teacher education and reflective practice. In B.R. Tabachnick & K.M. Zeichner (Eds.), Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education (pp. 166-185). London: Falmer.

Tinning, R. (1991). Teacher education pedagogy: Dominant discourses and the process of problem solving. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 11(1), 1-20.

Tom, A.R. (1985). Inquiring into inquiry-oriented teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(5), 35-44.

Tsangaridou, N., & O'Sullivan, M. (in press). Using pedagogical reflective strategies to enhance reflection among preservice physical education teachers. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education.

Van Manen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. Curriculum Inquiry, 6(3), 205-228.

Wood, P.O. (1991). The cooperating teacher's role in nurturing reflective thinking. In B.R. Tabachnick & K.M. Zeichner (Eds.), Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education (pp. 202-210). London: Falmer.

Yinger, R., & Clark, C. (1981). Reflective journal writing: Theory and Practice. East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, Occasional Paper no. 50.

Zeichner, K. (1987). Preparing reflective teachers: An overview of instructional strategies which have been employed in preservice teacher education. International Journal of Educational Research, 11(5), 565-575.

Zeichner, K., & Liston, D.P. (1985). Varieties of discourse in supervisory conferences. Teaching & Teacher Education, 1(2), 155-174.

Zeichner, K., & Liston, D.P. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 23-48.

Zeichner, K.M., & Teitelbaum, K. (1982). Personalized and inquiry-oriented teacher education: An analysis of two different approaches to the development of curriculum for field-based experiences. Journal of Education for Teaching, 8(2), 95-117.

Directive Conference

Strength

A. You provided accurate skill cues to the learners. Excellent!
B. Your progression for teaching the pass was great! It allowed for entry at different levels.

Needs Improvement

A. You demonstrated defensive position to the learners, but you didn't follow-up with a demonstration of how the students were to perform the skill in the drill. Students were confused which lead to an increase in transition and management time.
B. Think about the progression to teach the defensive stance/movement. Might want to let them practice individually at first, then with a partner but with no ball, and finally with a partner who is dribbling the ball.

Strength

A. I like how you paired the kids for the drill. You mixed them (male and female). Great idea to allow for equity.

Collaborative Conference

Teacher: Tell me about the lesson.
Student: .....

Teacher: Tell me what happened when the students entered the first drill?
Student: .....
Teacher: Why do you think that happened?
Student: .....

Teacher: Tell me about the task presentation.
Student: .....
Teacher: How did the kids do?
Student: .....
Teacher: How do you know?
Student: .....

Teacher: Tell me about the drill subject matter.
Student: .....
Teacher: Was it appropriate?
Student: .....
Teacher: Would you do something differently if you had to teach the lesson again?
Student: .....

Teacher: Tell me about the pairing of kids in the last drill?
Student: .....
Teacher: What effect do you think the pairing technique used had on the kids learning?
Student: .....

Figure 1. Sample dialogue during a directive and a collaborative post-lesson supervisory conference.

Reflections on Reflecting

1. Tell me about reflecting on your teaching.
2. Tell me about the significant event exercise.
3. Tell me about the video-commentary exercise.
4. Tell me about the supervision strategy employed (directive or collaborative).

Figure 2. Post-study questionnaire form.

Focus of Reflection	
Technical:	The skill demonstration was poor.
Situational:	I need to teach at the level of the learner.
Sensitizing:	I tried to include males and females in each group, but . . .

Level of Reflection	
Description:	I felt good about my teaching . . .
Justification:	because the class remained on task.
Critique:	According to the checklist results, the students did learn.

Figure 3. Samples of focus and level of reflection categories.

Table 1. Frequency and percent scores for focus of reflection.

Focus	Directive Group F (%)		Collaborative Group F (%)	
Technical	29	(80.6)	30	(55.6)
Situational	6	(16.7)	14	(25.9)
Sensitizing	1	(2.7)	10	(18.5)
Total	36	(100)	54	(100)

Table 2. Frequency and percent scores for each focus of reflection assignment.

Focus	Directive Group F (%)		Collaborative Group F (%)	
Technical				
Significant Event	13	(72.2)	7	(30.4)
Video-commentary	16	(88.9)	23	(74.2)
Situational				
Significant Event	4	(22.2)	9	(39.1)
Video-commentary	2	(1.1)	5	(16.1)
Sensitizing				
Significant Event	1	(5.6)	7	(30.4)
Video-commentary	0	(0.0)	3	(9.7)
Total				
Significant Event	18	(100)	23	(100)
Video-commentary	18	(100)	31	(100)

Table 3. Frequency and percent scores for level of reflection.

Level	Directive Group F	(%)	Collaborative Group F	(%)
Description	7	(19.4)	12	(22.2)
Description-Justification	6	(16.7)	14	(25.9)
Description-Critique	12	(33.3)	13	(24.1)
Description-Justification-Critique	11	(30.6)	15	(27.8)
Total	36	(100)	54	(100)

Table 4. Frequency and percent scores for each level of reflection assignment.

Level	Directive Group F	(%)	Collaborative Group F	(%)
Description				
Significant Event	5	(27.8)	5	(21.7)
Video-commentary	2	(11.1)	7	(22.6)
Description-Justification				
Significant Event	4	(22.2)	8	(34.8)
Video-commentary	2	(11.1)	7	(22.6)
Description-Critique				
Significant Event	2	(11.1)	3	(13.0)
Video-commentary	10	(55.6)	10	(32.3)
Description-Justification-Critique				
Significant Event	7	(38.9)	7	(30.5)
Video-commentary	4	(22.2)	8	(25.8)
Total				
Significant Event	18	(100)	23	(100)
Video-commentary	18	(100)	31	(100)